

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 3 has been amended to correct a typographical error. No claims have been canceled or added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 17 and 18 have been withdrawn from consideration in response to a restriction requirement. Claims 1-16 and 19 are under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 15, 16 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,453,541 issued to Guthrie et al. ("Guthrie"). At least for the reasons set forth herein, this rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia:

disc pushers which are slidably provided outside of the hub unit and include corresponding pressure members which push circumferences of the discs and center the discs; and
a driving unit which drives the disc pushers simultaneously.

Claim 19 recites, inter alia:

disc pushers which are slidably provided outside of the hub and include corresponding pressure members which push circumferences of the plurality of discs and center the plurality of discs; and
a driving unit which drives the disc pushers simultaneously.

Guthrie discloses a method and apparatus for centering discs in a disc drive. Guthrie discloses a centering box assembly having a spacer centering springs for applying pressure to spacers in between discs in a disc pack to center the spacers. *Guthrie*, cols. 10-11, lines 58-3. Each spacer centering spring is connected to a corresponding carriage. *Id.*

In contrast to the above-recited features, Guthrie mentions a mechanism "within each carriage" that "uses a torsion spring to control the movement of [each] carriage by its overload and underload sensor protection." *Guthrie*, col. 12, lines 8-12. Accordingly, Guthrie cannot be relied upon for disclosing a driving unit which drives disc pushers simultaneously.

The Applicants respectfully submit that since Guthrie fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1 and 19, these claims are allowable over Guthrie. Thus, withdrawal of the 102 rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of claims 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 15 and 16 these claims depend directly or indirectly on independent claim 1, and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons noted above.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that claims 2, 4, 7, 9 and 11-14 have been found to contain allowable subject matter. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable as set forth above. Accordingly, claims 2, 4, 7, 9 and 11-14 are believed to be allowable as is.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Feb. 28, 2007

By: 

David J. Cutillo
Registration No. 52,790

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501